



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/589,799	06/08/2000	Baljeet Singh Baweja	AUS0000172.US1	9729

7590 07/03/2003

International Business Machines Corporation  
Intellectual Property Law Department  
Internal Zip 4054  
11400 Burnet Road  
Austin, TX 78758

EXAMINER

PATEL, HARESH N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 07/03/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SM

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/589,799

Applicant(s)

BAWEJA ET AL.

Examiner

Haresh Patel

Art Unit

2127

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06/08/2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2. 6) ☐ Other:

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 12, 13 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamane et. al. (6,317,786). (Hereinafter Yamane).

4. As per claims 1, 7 and 12 Yamane teaches the following:

a workload balancing system for distributing data processing transactions (e.g. balancing the web page request service load among the multiple servers, col. 3, lines 60-65) into a plurality of messages and for dynamically allocating each of said messages (e.g. dynamic performance statistics, col. 10, lines 61-66) to different computer systems for performance comprising,

a method for distributing data processing transactions into a plurality of messages and for dynamically allocating each of said messages to different computer systems for performance comprising (e.g., reporting of the data as well as automatic and manual analysis tools, abstract),

Art Unit: 2127

a computer program having program code included on a computer readable medium (e.g., shared memory buffer, col 12, line 28) for workload balancing of distributed data processing transactions comprising:

means for requesting the performance of a data processing transaction (e.g., web page request, col. 10, lines 55-60),

a server computer for said distributing said transaction into a plurality of messages and allocating said messages to different computer systems (web server may provide reporting of the data as well as automatic and manual analysis tools, col. 3 line 60 – col. 4 line 14), and

user interactive display means for displaying said allocated messages and associated computer systems (e.g., event log of a web service system, figure 9).

5. As per claims 2, 8 and 13, Yamane teaches the following:

a server queue for strong the plurality of messages from the distributed transaction. (e.g. the number of requests in the queue at the time the request is responded to, col. 10, lines 46-61).

6. As per claims 18, 19 and 20, Yamane teaches the following:

means enabling a user to request the performance of a data processing transaction (e.g., web page request, col. 10, lines 55-60),

a server computer for dynamically transforming requested transactions into messages without user input and allocating said messages to different computer systems (web server may provide reporting of the data as well as automatic and manual analysis tools, col. 3 line 60 – col. 4 line 14), and

user interactive display means for displaying said allocated messages and associated computer systems (e.g., event log of a web service system, figure 9).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 3-5, 9-11 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamane in view of Wolff 6,185,601.

Yamane does not specifically show the claimed limitations of claims 3-5, 9-11 and 14-16.

Wolff teaches the following:

each of said different computer systems has an associated queue for storing messages allocated to each respective computer system (queue of server rebalance requests, e.g. col. 32, lines 60-62),

at least one of said different computer systems has means for reallocating to other computer systems, messages initially allocated to said one computer system (e.g., re-mapping of an alternate path can be intelligently accomplished on the basis of an overall utilization and path table, or randomly on the basis of client queries to alternate nodes in response to an overload condition, col. 5, lines 38-60)

user interactive means for displaying said reallocated messages and computer systems to which said messages are allocated (e.g., display screen, figure 2A).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Yamane with the teachings of Wolff in order to provide a server to facilitate message driven transaction environment to implement the tracking of the route of an item which the user selects from the display screen.

8. Claims 6 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamane in view of Suzuki 5,884,077.

Yamane does not specifically show the limitation of claims 6 and 17.

Suzuki teaches the following:

an interactive display computer including said means for requesting the performance of a data processing transaction and user interactive display means for displaying said allocated messages and associated computer systems (e.g., user interface, figure 1).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Yamane with the teachings of Suzuki in order to provide a computer to facilitate to create a graphical user interface for the user, which can allow the user to request information from the connected server and then to display the received information.

### ***Conclusion***

The following prior art is cited but not relied upon:

Art Unit: 2127

- a. 6,279,001, DeBettencourt et al.. DeBettencourt teaches dynamic workload balancing of the web page requests.
- b. 6,038,601, Lambert et al.. Lambert teaches a method for maintaining statistics on a server, receiving a request from a server on a network, validating a collection of data and providing notification to the clients from servers.
- c. 5,825,769, O'Reilly et al.. O'Reilly teaches how a remote subscriber may link up with a real time statistics system to monitor the operation of the network.
- d. 5,537,550, Russell et al. Russell teaches distribution of message driven transactions in a network environment.
- e. 5,938,722, Johnson teaches method of executing programs in a network.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haresh Patel whose telephone number is (703) 605-5234. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee, can be reached at (703) 305-8498.

The appropriate fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 306-5404.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Haresh Patel

June 16, 2003.

**JOHN FOLLANSBEE**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**